

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL BOSCHETTI,

Plaintiff,

v.

DANIEL O'BLENIS,

Defendant.

No. C 13-0628 CW

ORDER DENYING  
DEFENDANT'S MOTION  
TO SEAL (Docket  
No. 11)

On April 4, 2013, Defendant Daniel Everett,<sup>1</sup> proceeding pro se, filed a motion to seal the entire docket in this case. He did not, however, provide a declaration establishing that every document in this case is sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5.<sup>2</sup> Under that rule, the Court may only order a document to be sealed if it "is privileged or protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law." Civil Local Rule 79-5(a). While Defendant alleges that the San Francisco County Superior Court -- where this action was originally filed -- previously granted the parties' joint request to seal this case, that order is not binding on this Court.

If Defendant wishes to seal documents filed after he removed this case from state court, then he must file a motion to seal and accompanying declaration establishing that those documents are

<sup>1</sup> Although Defendant is named in this action as Daniel O'Blevins, he has identified himself as Daniel Everett in his motion.

<sup>2</sup> Defendant filed this motion under section 1161.2 of the California Rules of Civil Procedure. However, as noted above, sealing motions in this Court are governed by Civil Local Rule 79-5.

1 sealable under Civil Local Rule 79-5(a). Because he has not done  
2 so here, his motion to seal (Docket No. 11) is DENIED.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4  
5 Dated: 4/8/2013

6   
CLAUDIA WILKEN  
United States District Judge

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
  
United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California